

I oppose loosening the rules designed to promote and protect diversity of media ownership. These rules were adopted to ensure that the public would receive a diverse range of viewpoints from the media, and not simply the opinions of a handful of media conglomerates.

I sincerely believe that further consolidation of the media market would be detrimental to the marketplace of ideas--as well as to the marketplace of commerce. I don't see the Internet providing adequate diversity to allow a consolidation of ownership of tv/radio stations. Most of the news I receive from friends via the Internet comes ultimately from the same major networks who operate on television. I have noticed that the range of opinions expressed in the few media outlets with much of an audience is shrinking. This can't be good for our democracy. While an independent web site may be a viable attempt to convey an alternative point of view, the size of the audience it reaches is what truly matters for the purpose of this debate. I don't believe web sites should all be counted equally, as if they were channels on the tv dial--people will never find smaller sites without advertising from major media outlets which will not be forthcoming if such alternative outlets truly are ! to offer an alternative. And web

sites that are extensions of preexisting major media conglomerates shouldn't be counted separately either--though the format is different, the point of view is the same.

I believe there should be more limits placed on ownership of radio/tv/newspaper (traditional) media outlets. There should be less consolidation, not more. It appears to me that these traditional media outlets still guide mainstream opinion and entertainment.

I don't believe that commonly owned media have stronger incentives to provide diverse content. Having the same pool as its source, such good intentions (assuming there are good intentions), the potential for diversity is limited. There must be more owners of influential media, not fewer, in order to support the vigorous and diverse range of debate vital for our future.